

501
12, 304



THE



REVIEWER REVIEWED;

OR,

AN ANSWER TO STRICTURES

CONTAINED IN THE

PRINCETON BIBLICAL REPERTORY,

FOR JULY, 1840,

ON DR. HILL'S HISTORY OF THE RISE, PROGRESS, GENIUS,

AND CHARACTER,

OF


AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM.

BY SIMPLEX

NEW YORK:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1842.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<http://archive.org/details/reviewe00newy>

MOTTOS AND MEMENTOS.

He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just ; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him. Prov. 18: 17.

Knowest thou it, because thou wast then born ? or because the number of thy days is great ? Job 38: 21.

“ There are some clergy, like military cadets, or titled and epauletted generals, who are learned in the tactics and technicalities of war ; but who, having never seen action or been tried *in the high places of the field*, mistake sadly the duties and the spirit of their commission ; and seldom or never perform any of that sort of humble service for which mainly their education and their office were procured for them. These are not inaptly called the amateur clergy. They are generally theorizers, partisans, and special pleaders ; and withal somewhat remarkably learned. They are intoxicated with place and power. They love to *have the preeminence* ; and while very orthodox in maintaining some of the ideal forms of the first table of the decalogue, are seemingly quite too sublimated to make a proportionate honoring of the second table a part or a measure of their personal piety. At any rate, the fifth commandment, though the first of that table, receives very little illustration from the manner in which they treat the veterans of the service, who were doing fatigue duty for the church before their censurs were born.”

“ And there are some learned and plausible men, whose greatest skill is in misrepresentation. They are specious and powerful ; but the public always need to be disabused by other pens, after theirs have spread a too grateful enchantment over plain matters of fact.”

☞ This answer has been long prepared, and would have appeared sooner, had not the delay occurred incidentally after the manuscript had passed into the hand of another.

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

IN the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review for July, 1840, strictures upon Dr. Hill's History of the rise, progress, genius, and character of American Presbyterianism, are to be found, of a very peculiar character, which call for some short notice. The publication now to be noticed, is anonymous, and its real paternity is a matter of very little consequence. The strong presumption is, that it is either the production of Dr. Hodge himself, or of some friend of his, who wrote it as a mere amanuensis, or under his own eye, and aided by his materials and promptings.

This publication is designed as a defence of Professor Hodge's Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church, against some criticisms, and charges of inaccuracy brought against him by Dr. Hill ;—and if you may judge from the style and character of this Princeton review, our learned Professor must have been writhing and smarting under some of the strictures made by Dr. Hill.

This is not much to be wondered at, for Professor H. has certainly acquired considerable distinction as a writer, and has had as much incense offered to him as would be safe for most men of his age.

Professor Hodge, or his friend for him, in the Princeton Review, manifests considerable ingenuity in endeavoring to shift the grounds of the controversy. Their old position was found an unsafe one, which exposed them to a galling fire from an opponent ;—therefore a more safe and sheltered one is sought for. Every intelligent and candid reader of the 1st and 2nd parts of Professor H.'s history must know and acknowledge that throughout this whole work, the position taken was, that the entire system of the Kirk of Scotland, as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Form of Government, and Book of Discipline, as practised by that Church, was adopted at first, and formed an essential feature of American Presbyterianism at its commencement and ever since. It would be vain to heap up quotations to prove this. I shall make one quotation only as a sample of scores that might be produced upon this subject. See Professor Hodge's History, Part 1st, p. 20.

"The young daughter of the church of Scotland," (meaning the American church,) "helpless, and exposed in a foreign land, cries to her tender parent for relief. Whose language is this?" (says

Prof. H.) "Not that of the old side Synod. It is the language of the new side Synod. Both parties in our church have appealed to its early history in support of their peculiar opinions. It is the object of this work to review that history, *in order to show* that our church has demanded adherence to the system of doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, as the condition of ministerial communion, &c."

Now we will hear what the Princeton review says upon this subject. See July No. for 1840. p. p. 323. 324.

"Whenever there is controversy, it is desirable to know the state of the question; to have the point at issue distinctly presented. Prof. H. took the ground that our church, from its very organization in this country, adopted that form of government which had been previously adopted in Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and by the Protestants of France. He described the system intended, as requiring the government of particular congregations, to be vested in the pastor and eldership, and not in the brotherhood; and the association of several churches under one presbytery, composed of ministers and elders: and as providing for provincial and national Synods, in which were vested the authority of review and control, and the right to set down rules for the government of the church. There are here three points presented with tolerable distinctness. First, the leading principles of Presbyterianism; secondly, the prevalence of this system of government in the plans mentioned; and thirdly, its adoption by our own church. There is no question here, about the rigor with which the system was enforced—about the authority attributed to it, whether it was of *divine right*, or *apostolical example*, or *mere expediency*; whether it was essential to the being of a church' or merely the best form of government. *Not one of these questions was raised.* It was merely stated what Presbyterianism is' and asserted that certain specified churches were Presbyterian. One would think that the only course for an opponent to take, was to attack one or the other of these positions—to show that Presbyterianism does not include the above mentioned principles, or that it was not adopted in that form by the churches in question. This, we admit, would have been rather an adventurous enterprise; still it was the only thing to be done. But Dr. Hill has seen fit to take a very different course. He first asserts that Prof. Hodge contends, that our church adopted the strict Scotch system, and then he gives the following description of that system, &c."

What an inoffensive, and harmless position, according to this statement, must Professor H. have taken. And how inexcusable must Dr. Hill have been in misunderstanding and misconstruing these harmless positions which no body ever disputed. Our author must have been sick of his cause, when he wished to escape from it, by a subterfuge like this. It must have required a considerable degree of hardihood to venture the assertion, *that there was no question about*

the rigor with which the system was enforced in Professor H.'s History. See Part 1st, p. 18.

"In the Synod, (i. e. the French Synod,) in 1644-5, it was reported by certain deputies from the maritime provinces, that there do arrive to them, from other countries, some persons going by the name of Independents, &c. and that they settle their dwellings in this *kingdom*, [let the reader remember this word kingdom,] a thing of great and dangerous consequence, if not in time carefully prevented. Now, this assembly, fearing lest the contagion of this poison should diffuse itself insensibly, and bring in a world of disorder and confusion upon us, all the provinces are therefore enjoined, but more especially those bordering on the sea, to be exceedingly careful that this evil do not get footing in the churches in this *kingdom*." Again, says Prof. H. :

"There are many acts of these Synods, *which would make modern ears tingle*, and which prove that American Presbyterianism, in its strictest forms, was a sucking dove compared to that of the immediate descendants of the reformers. To maintain truth and order in the churches, in those days, required a sterner purpose, and firmer conviction than are commonly to be met with *at the present time*, when many are wont to change their church and creed, almost as readily as they change their clothes.* This account of the French church has been given," (says Professor H.,) "because it will appear in the sequel, that there was, *at an early period, a strong infusion of French Presbyterianism in the churches of this country*, and it is well to know something of its character."

There can be no mistake when Professor Hodge uses language like this. How rude and unmanly was it in Dr. Hill to assail an innocent and unoffending Professor, so needlessly, *when he raised no question about the rigor with which his system was enforced, but merely meant to state in the abstract what Presbyterianism was?*

Let us hear the Princeton reviewer once more upon this subject. See p. 326.

"Should an American Episcopalian say, that his church was the daughter of the church of England, and had adopted the essential principles of her form of government, he certainly would treat with silence the assertion, that he thereby claimed the lordly titles, the varied powers, and the exclusive principles of the English Hierarchy?"

But not so fast, Mr. Reviewer, in coming to your conclusion. Let

* Professor Hodge should have been a little more modest in speaking about people's changing their *church and creeds*, as readily as they change their clothes, when he recollects the doctrines advanced, and sentiments maintained by himself and other Princeton Professors, in the Biblical Repertory, in the year 1835, respecting the call of a convention to reform and purify the church, and subsequently, when it was evident that a division of the church was intended. Compare that state of things with the present, and then judge who are the changelings. If this will not make his ears tingle, I trust it would, at least, suffice his cheeks with a blush.

us suppose that this American daughter of the English Hierarchy should declare at the same time, that she adopted not only the essential principles of the English system, but her entire Prayer Book, including her Articles, form of worship, and administering the ordinances, her form of government, by Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and so forth, with all their distinctive powers and modes of consecration, to the end; that she was in fact, part and parcel of the same, and bound to carry out all her laws, canons, and enactments, and to follow her example in persecuting dissenters and in enforcing uniformity; would such declarations satisfy dissenters and others in this country, who had fled from their homes to escape her tyrannic grasp, that this young American daughter was a very sweet, harmless, and innocent little creature?

What was the American daughter of the Scotch Kirk, of which Professor H. speaks so affectionately, as possessing such inoffensive qualities? Does not the Scotch Confession of Faith, which Professor H. insists that the American church had adopted from the first, include not only her entire system of doctrines, but of government and discipline? Aye! more; does it not include her National League, together with her exclusive and persecuting Solemn League and Covenant, which this Mother Kirk would have constrained all in the realm as well as those in her connection, to take, or be dealt with as abettors or fautors of popery, prelacy, heresy, and other mischiefs, whenever she had it in her power? This is Professor Hodge's young American daughter—his young sucking dove, which we must all handle with so much tenderness, and nurse with so much care.

But if Dr. Hill should say a word respecting the objectionable parts of this Scotch system, though he should apologize for her weakness from the darkness of the times, and the spirit of the day, and give all due credit, as he again and again has done, for all the excellencies of the system, he is now to be classed with papists, and infidels, and enemies of every character, for aspersing the fair fame of the good old Mother Kirk. It is a little remarkable, that in all the quotations made from Dr. Hill's statements, respecting the principles of the Scotch Kirk, and all the abusive epithets applied to him for so doing, the correctness of the statements he gave of the principles and character of the Church of Scotland has not been called into question in a solitary instance; nor an attempt made to prove that he had slandered the Kirk. On such evil times have we fallen, that whosoever will not go the whole of this system—who will not "swallow the total grist, unsifted, husks and all," must expect to be classed with malignant opposers of all that is orthodox and sound in the church. Such gross man-worshippers, and idolaters of system, have many among us now become! The soul of the writer holds in contempt such puerility and servility. He is not to be frightened with such menaces or bugbears as this.

No. II.

We shall now notice another subject which the Princeton reviewer brings forward with a great flourish, as affording him a complete triumph, and which so effectually will demolish Dr. Hill as to render useless all that he had said, or might hereafter say on subjects of this nature. The reader should be reminded that Dr. Hill in the first part of his history had produced copious extracts from Mosheim's and Neal's histories and others, flatly contradicting Professor Hodge's character of the French Huguenots.

We shall give extracts at large from our reviewer, unbroken by replies, that his wonted vamping may appear in its full force; and reserve the privilege of commenting at the close. See Princeton Review, pp. 230, 231, and 232.

"It may be admitted that false doctrine had made its appearance among the French Protestants before their great overthrow, and that their descendants departed still further from the faith; and yet every word that Professor Hodge said about this ecclesiastical system be correct; and every word that Dr. Hill said be wrong. In other words, the extracts from Mosheim (*the historical verity of whose statements we are far from admitting*) have nothing to do with the subject at issue. Before leaving this subject we will give our readers a specimen of the manner in which Dr. Hill spins history out of his imagination, and sets down vague impressions as positive facts. We just quoted one passage in which he gave an account of the state of the French church, when the declaration against the Independents was made. He returns to the subject again and says: [Here he gives a quotation from Dr. Hill.] 'At the time the French Synod, in 1644, passed the act which Prof. H. cites with such apparent pleasure, the Protestants in France were in great favor with the reigning king, Francis I, who, out of opposition to Charles V, did many very absurd and inconsistent things respecting the reformation. He would patronize or persecute them just as he could make it subserve his purposes of state. He permitted his sister, the queen of Navarre, to establish the reformation in the kingdom of Navarre; and it was during the days of this prosperity, and when gross darkness rested upon christians of every nation, respecting liberty of conscience, and religious freedom, that these good French Protestants did those wicked things that Prof. H. refers to, and which I did expect he would have noticed, with at least some apology or mark of disapprobation. But no! the poor Independents were to be proscribed and banished forthwith, for fear they would diffuse the contagion of their poison, and introduce a world of disorders into the provinces.' [Now hear the reviewer's comment upon this quotation.]

"Francis I. [says he] was born in the year 1494, ascended the

throne in 1515; and if still living in 1644, he was in the 129th year of his reign, and the 150th of his life. According to all other accounts he died in 1547, i. e. ninety-seven years before the date of his great favor to the Protestants. It need be hardly said that all the minor statements of this paragraph are of the same kind with the preceding. There was, in 1644, no queen of Navarre; *and no such kingdom in the sense in which Dr. Hill uses the terms.* The Protestants, so far from being established and in high favor, or at the right hand of power, were reduced to a state of complete dependence. By the acts of Richelieu, under the reign of Louis XIII, they had, by fraud or force, been despoiled of all their strong towns; Rochelle, their last defence, fell in 1629. From this time they were at the mercy of their enemies. Louis XIV. came to the throne in 1643; his mother, Ann of Austria, acting as regent, and cardinal Mazarin administered the government as prime minister. All, therefore, that Dr. Hill has said about the historical circumstances under which the declaration against the Independents was made, is pure fiction. He, of course, had no intention to deceive any body; for whom could he deceive? But it is evident that he has not the slightest idea of the responsibility of a historian; that he allows himself to write down just what comes into his head, and that he is the last man in the world who is entitled to speak of others as unworthy of confidence."

If Dr. Hill can survive this murderous assault, this butchering process, one might suppose he need fear nothing that may befall him hereafter. We will see, however, whether any relief can be afforded him after this rough handling.

That the reader may see the point and force of these remarks of the Princeton reviewer, it may be necessary to explain, a little, the point at issue. Dr. Hill, in reply to the authorities which Professor H. had brought forward to show that the French Protestants were high toned exclusives, who had banished the Independents, who had taken refuge among them, from the persecuting Episcopalians of England;—and that the Presbyterians in America were in their strictest days and most rigorous measures but a sucking dove to the Huguenots. Professor H. had also asserted that there had been a strong infusion of the same principles made by the French refugees into the American church, at an early day. To rebut all these averments, Dr. Hill had stated that the French Protestants were a very different people in different parts of their history;—while in power and authority, they were overbearing and oppressive, but when in adversity, and struggling with difficulties themselves, they were liberal in doctrine, and tolerant in government. In proof of this, Dr. Hill had quoted largely from Mosheim, Neal, and others. These arguments and authorities appear to have disturbed Dr. Hodge and his friends, more than a little.

But as people are more apt to use abusive language, and angry remarks, when hard pushed, instead of better arguments, so here we

find more scurrilous and ungentlemanly language than might have been expected from Professor H. or any of his Princeton associates upon this occasion. We shall now give this vituperative extract a little notice.

1. The reviewer admits that all that Dr. Hill had produced from Mosheim respecting false doctrine among the Huguenots might be true, and yet all that Professor Hodge had said respecting ecclesiastical polity, be strictly true, and all that Dr. Hill had said upon the subject, be entirely wrong. This goes upon the supposition that all that was quoted from Mosheim and others, related to doctrine, and not at all to government;—whereas a reference to those quotations will show that reference was had to their ideas respecting indulgence and tolerance when they were excluding or disciplining those who differed from them in *sentiment*; as well as to terms of uniting with others, who differed on non-essential points. But as if afraid to rest Professor Hodge's defence upon so flimsy an argument, Dr. Mosheim's character is about as rudely treated, (and from his own admission quite unnecessarily,) as he had just treated Dr. Hill's character. In a short parenthetical sentence, Mosheim's veracity as a historian is flatly called in question. "*The historical verity of whose statements we are far from admitting.*" After such strange language, one would naturally expect to be told wherein he had falsified, and where better and more authentic historical information could be obtained. But not a word of this. *You lie, Sir*, is all the argument. This is a summary way of ending an argument and claiming a victory. The fact is, that Mosheim's statement so completely answered and refuted what Professor Hodge had alleged, that no alternative seemed to be left, but to deny that Mosheim deserved any credit at all, or to leave Professor Hodge convicted of being as ignorant of historical facts, as he now undertakes to prove that Dr. Hill was.

2. But suppose Dr. Hill had misplaced some dates and facts, in giving a summary account of the rise and progress of the Protestant reformers in France, or that in haste he had expressed himself loosely and incautiously, (which in candor is readily admitted,) would that inaccuracy in dates affect the main argument, to which these mistakes had no relation at all? Can any one suppose that in giving a hasty and summary account of the rise and progress of the reformation in France, Dr. Hill meant to make all the changes and fluctuations through which Protestantism passed, for about 150 years, synchronize strictly with the persecution of the Independents, which took place in 1644? This is a pitiful captiousness, to which no candid disputant, who could command better arguments, would ever resort. But can Professor H. feel willing to trust to such a quibble to wipe off the stigma of quoting with such apparent approbation the persecuting acts of the French Protestants; and then commenting upon it as he did;—and at last attempting to fix such a slander upon American Presbyterianism as saying that there was a strong infusion of the same principles in that church at an early period of its history?

3. Our learned and accurate reviewer informs his readers, that in

the year 1644, the time to which Dr. Hill referred, "*there was no Queen of Navarre, and no such kingdom, in the sense in which he used that term.*" In what sense he supposed Dr. Hill used the word kingdom, it is for him to say. Dr. Hill simply asserted that there was such a kingdom at the time alluded to, and that the Protestants were in power in that kingdom. But this our reviewer denies. What meaning can he put on such words as these, which have just been quoted from Professor H. himself? From the records of Synod (says he) in 1644, "it was reported by certain Deputies from the *maritime provinces* that there do arrive from other countries some persons going by the name of Independents, and that they settle their dwellings in this *Kingdom*, a thing of dangerous consequence if not in time carefully prevented. Now this assembly—do *enjoin it* upon all the Provinces, but especially those bordering on the sea, to be exceedingly careful that this evil do not get footing in the churches in *this Kingdom.*" From this record we learn that the kingdom of Navarre still existed at the time alluded to; that it contained many provinces;—that the French Protestants were numerous and their religion established in that kingdom;—and that they had power to suppress heresy and prosecute heretics, which was done in compliance with the orders of their General Synod. This is all that Dr. Hill asserted, but this is now denied. Hear the reviewer further. "The Protestants, so far from being established, or in high favor, or at the right hand of power, were reduced to a state of complete dependence. All therefore that Dr. Hill has said about this matter is pure fiction."

Take a plain story now from the Rev. James Saurin, that eminent Huguenot divine and confessor for the truth, in *his memoirs of the reformation of France* prefixed to his sermons, pp. 40, 41. Says he, "Cardinal Richlieu's hoary head went down to the grave in 1642, without the tears of his Master, and with the hatred of all France. The King soon followed him in 1643, complaining, in the words of Job, "*My soul is weary of life.*" The Protestants *had increased greatly in numbers in this reign*, though they had lost their power, for they were now computed to exceed two millions. So true is it, that violent measures weaken the church that employs them. Louis XIV was only in the fifth year of his age at the demise of his father. The Queen Mother was appointed sole regent during his minority, and Cardinal Mazarin, a creature of Richlieu's, was his prime minister. The Edict of Nantz was confirmed in 1643 [only one year before the banishment of the Independents] by the Regent, and again by the King, at his majority, 1652."

It will be left now with the intelligent reader to judge which is the more completely demolished, our learned Princeton reviewer, or Dr. Hill. There is but one way for him to escape from this dilemma, which is the same easy and effectual remedy by which he saved Professor Hodge from the strait in which he was placed by the testimony of Mosheim; namely, "*The historical verity of whose statement we are far from admitting.*"

No. III.

The remarks of the reviewer respecting the settlements made on the west side of the River Delaware are but repetitions of what Professor H. had before said. He has, however, one additional argument by which to prove his point. See p. 339. "The settlement from New Haven, we infer, from its being noticed by Gordon, in his history of New Jersey, was on the east side." But mark it. Gordon does not say it was on the east side; but simply mentioned, among other matters, the existence of such a settlement upon the river Delaware at that time. Is this a sample of Princeton logic?

The arguments produced by Dr. Hill to show that New Englanders had formed settlements at an early period on the river Delaware, and especially on the west side, were such as these,

1. Under the charter granted to Lord Baltimore for the colony of Maryland in 1632, his lordship claimed all the territory which lay from Cape Henlopen on the river Delaware as far as the mouth of the Schuylkill; and the utmost liberty of conscience was guaranteed by said charter to all colonists who would settle within its limits. In 1640, a large body of land was purchased by a company of merchants about New Haven, and a settlement was begun there at that time. In 1642, settlers claiming to be Marylanders, formed a settlement about the mouth of the Schuylkill, which however was soon broken up by the Dutch. In the year 1643, the settlers upon the Delaware complained to the civil authorities in New England, that they were much molested by the Swedes and the Dutch, and prayed for assistance, and especially that reinforcements of settlers might be sent them, which Governor Winthrop was unwilling at that time to grant, as they had need themselves both of men and money. The same year, 1643, Lord Baltimore, (hearing no doubt of the unsuccessful application made to the government of New England,) invited settlers to come from New England to Maryland, promising them land and full liberty of conscience within his colony.

2. The inducements were much greater for the New Englanders to settle on the west than on the east of the river;—the land was far preferable, the climate better, and the dangers and hazards to which they would be exposed, were fewer on the west than east side, besides the promise of protection from the proprietor of Maryland.

In 1682, the settlements upon the Delaware, which had hitherto been claimed by the Proprietor of Maryland, were confirmed by charter to William Penn, and became part of Pennsylvania. These two colonies were the only places then known where liberty of conscience and religious freedom could be obtained.

In the year 1694, only 11 years before the mother presbytery was formed, Sir Lionel Copely, who was Governor of Maryland, com-

plained to the Bishop of London, that there were but three Episcopal clergymen in the colony, and these had to contend with double their number of Roman Priests, and a number of wandering pretenders to be preachers, (as he called them,) from New England and other places, who kept dissenters from the Episcopal church, and even drew off many churchmen by their extemporary prayers and preachments.

From such reasons as these, Dr. Hill supposed it might be inferred, what kind of people they were, and what were their religious sentiments and predilections, who formed the first Presbyterian congregations in America, and whence they obtained their ministers.

Passing over other and slighter matters contained in the Princeton review, the attention of the reader shall now be called to the only remaining subject of any importance; which is, the absurdities and contradictions charged upon Dr. Hill, and the parade of quotations produced from the original minutes, and other documents, to prove them, relative to the first organization of the churches upon the Patuxent river in Maryland, especially the Scotch congregation, located in upper Marlborough, with Nathaniel Taylor their minister, who came over with them from Scotland. Dr. Balch's letters to Dr. Green are produced again with great confidence, as affording evidence of Dr. Hill's utter incapacity for writing upon such subjects. Here our reviewer claims a second triumph with such confidence, that many would suppose that Dr. Hill must be smothered at once, or nailed as a counterfeit to the counter, as unworthy of credit for the future. Let the reader suspend his judgment for a short time, until he shall hear a word on the other side of the question, when he may probably find that all this confident boasting over a vanquished enemy was a little premature.

Before we meet this formidable array of arguments and documentary evidence, we must say, that it should not be thought strange, if Dr. Hill, laboring under the disadvantages which he did, from the want of access to the original papers, which are carefully kept for the exclusive use of his opponents, should not have been precisely accurate in some of his references to old records. He could not meet his antagonist here, upon equal ground. Dr. Hill complained before, that he was assailed by unfair or unlawful weapons, against which he had not the chance of defending himself.

Not only are the minutes and other Presbyterian and Synodical documents kept for the exclusive use of a favored few, or loaned with such restrictions and limitations, as to be of little use, but reference is continually had to, and authority adduced from, a mass of private and unpublished manuscripts, from which only one side had permission to cull and select, to conceal or suppress, at pleasure. But enough of these jumbled quotations and garbled statements have now come to light, to show what credit is due to such *ex parte* compilations. Our obligations are due, however, to our late reviewer, for giving us a little more information than was formerly exhibited, of Dr. Balch's lucid communications, of which so much use has been

made, and from which such important conclusions have been drawn, to clear away the mists that rest upon the early history of our church. We may now have an opportunity from the selected parts of those letters, the whole of which we have never seen, (for as yet we have only a few scattering fragments of them,) to form a judgment of what they are really worth, and have them compare with documents which are authentic. If we should be obliged to stricture those communications with some freedom, we utterly disavow any unfriendly feelings toward Dr. Balch, and would wish to treat his memory with all possible respect, and would cautiously avoid saying any thing that might unnecessarily wound the feelings of any member of the respectable relatives he has left behind him. But the truth is not to be sacrificed, out of regard to any man; and the character of Dr. Hill needs protection, as well as that of Dr. Balch; and if his character for giving correct information upon historical facts should be exhibited in a rather unfavorable point of view, there is no intention to assail his respectability in other aspects of his character. He might have received incorrect statements from others, or might not have remembered distinctly, and might have written hastily, and without due reflection. But if complaint is made against any one, in this matter, it should not be against those who act only on the defensive, but against those who have thus needlessly dragged into light, what more required concealment, or a veil of charity.

Professor H. and his friend the reviewer would have acted more wisely, and more consistently with friendship for that venerable father, to have treated those letters as Dr. Green had done, for whose special benefit they were written, and from whom Professor H. tells us he obtained them. Dr. Green, in his *Christian Advocate*, vol. 8, p. 467, published in the year 1830, long after he had received and perused Dr. Balch's letters, makes this remark: "*The place where Taylor exercised his ministry, the writer has not been able satisfactorily to ascertain, nor the time of his death.*" Dr. Green must have seen, that there was an irreconcilable difference between Dr. Balch's statements, and the records of the Presbytery, with which he was well acquainted; for Dr. Balch undertook to tell, both where Taylor exercised his ministry, namely, at Upper Marlborough in Maryland, and when he died, namely, in 1703; whereas Dr. Green knew from the records that Taylor was alive and an active member of the Presbytery in 1709, seven years after Dr. Balch had him dead and buried. Dr. Green therefore passed his statements over, as well meant, but mistaken and incorrect, and therefore not worthy of further notice. But the zeal of Professor H. and his friend the reviewer, so far outran their discretion, as to determine them not to lose the opportunity of procuring the direct testimony of the only man they could procure, to prove that there was at least, one Scotch minister, and a Scotch congregation in the constituency of the mother Presbytery; and if Dr. Balch should contradict the records of the Presbytery, as they knew he would, they would tax their ingenuity to make even his ab-

surdities and contradictions redound to Dr. Balch's credit, as we shall presently see they have done.

To let the reader see the charges of absurdity and contradiction brought against Dr. Hill in their full force, the arguments and documents derived from the records of Presbytery shall now all be given in their true connection, and unbroken by replies and refutation, till after all the quotation from that quarter shall have been given, further than a few short explanations between brackets, as we go along, which, if the reader chooses, he may at the first reading pass over, and in so doing he will have the words of the reviewer verbatim. See Repertory, pp. 241, 242.

"The only remaining case is that of the Rev. Mr. Taylor. Prof. Hodge had stated, on the authority of the late Dr. Balch, that Col. Ninian Beall, a native of Scotland, having been driven from his own country by persecution, came to Maryland about 1690; that he wrote home to his friends and neighbors to join him, and that in consequence of his exertions about two hundred of them came over, bringing the Rev. Mr. Taylor as their pastor, and formed the church and congregation of Upper Marlborough. This account Dr. Hill very unceremoniously rejects. He calls it a *story*, a *tale*; says Dr. Balch was misinformed; conjectures that the account was received from him when he was far gone in second childhood, and so forth. He insists that the first account we hear of the church at Marlborough, was a petition sent to Presbytery, about the year 1715 or 1716, from a few Scotch merchants and others, for supplies of preaching. Two members, Messrs. Conn and Orme, were sent to those regions to missionate, and look after the people of Marlborough and others. Both of these ministers settled west of the Chesapeake, in Maryland, and Mr. Conn was ordained and settled at Marlborough, in the year 1716, as their first minister, as the records of Presbytery will show. The main position of Dr. Hill, and that on which his whole cause depends, is that *the congregation* of Marlborough is not mentioned in the minutes of Presbytery before 1715." [Mark this expression of Dr. Hill's; he did not say the people on Patuxent were not mentioned, but the congregation, or church of Marlborough, evidently meaning in an organized character, or as having a pastor. The reviewer proceeds:] "We must premise here, that Marlborough lies upon the Patuxent river, hence Dr. Hill sometimes calls the congregation in question, Marlborough, and sometimes Patuxent. [This is not so; Dr. Hill used no such language; it will be seen presently what led to this misunderstanding.] The minutes do the same thing. [This is a perversion of the minutes, as we shall soon see.] In 1715, it was ordered that a letter be written to *the people of Patuxent*, and we find it addressed to *our christian friends at Marlborough*; these, then, according to Dr. Hill and the minutes, were different names for the same congregation."

A plain story will set all this sophistry straight presently. "We meet again at Philippi." See now p. 343.

No. IV.

“As early as 1711, we find the following mention of *this congregation* :—‘Mr. McNish’s affair in reference to Patuxent was deferred to another time,’ p. 12 of the minutes ; and on the same page, Mr. McNish’s case came under consideration, and it was determined to leave his affair respecting Jamaica and Patuxent to himself, with the advice not to delay fixing himself somewhere. [Observe, the Presbytery never use the language ‘*of the congregation of Patuxent*,’ but it often speaks of the people on Patuxent. More of this anon.] The simple explanation of this minute [says the reviewer] is this. The Rev. Mr. Taylor, who Dr. Balch says, was *the first pastor of the Patuxent people*. [Dr. Balch uses this language, that Mr. Taylor was the first pastor of Marlborough ; this confusion of language belongs to the reviewer.] The Rev. Mr. Taylor, who, Dr. Balch says, was the first pastor of the Patuxent people died about 1710. [This is strange perversion of the truth, for Dr. Balch says he died 1703.] He was present at Presbytery in 1709, but never appeared again. His congregation being thus left vacant, they called Mr. McNish, [This is all gratuitous assumption, or ‘spinning history out of the reviewer’s own imagination,’] and he having at the same time received a call from Jamaica, Long Island, was left to decide between them. He decided in favor of Jamaica, where it was shown he settled in 1712, and accordingly supplies became necessary for Patuxent ; hence it was ordered that Mr. Wilson do supply the *people of Patuxent* four Sabbaths ; Mr. Henry four Sabbaths, and Mr. Hampton is left to himself to supply sometimes if he can. All this [says the reviewer] was in 1711. So much for the assertion, that there was no allusion to *the congregation* before 1716. Dr. Hill’s next assertion, namely, that Mr. Conn organized the church at Patuxent, and became their first pastor in 1715 or 1716, is of course refuted by the preceding records, which prove, at least, the existence of the congregation in 1711. This assertion is repeated in various forms and with much detail. ‘About the year 1714,’ says Dr. Hill, ‘two young licentiates, or students of theology, arrived from England, Hugh Conn, and John Orme. The next year, 1715, Mr. Conn was ordained, and sent to preach to the people about Patuxent and Bladensburg ; he organized congregations at both of these places, and became their first pastor, and lived and died such.’ It will appear from what follows, that Mr. Conn, so far from being the first pastor of Patuxent, was never pastor of that congregation at all. He was received by Presbytery as a licentiate in 1715, as appears from the following record : ‘Mr. James Gordon having presented a call from the people of Baltimore county, in Maryland, unto Mr. Hugh Conn, the Presbytery called for, considered, and approved the said Mr. Conn’s credentials, as a preacher of the gospel, and likewise considered and approved the call, which being presented by the moderator to Mr. Conn, he accepted of it ; whereupon it was appointed

that Messrs. Magill, Anderson, Gillespie, Wortherspoon, and Evans, after being satisfied of his ministerial abilities, should solemnly, by prayer, fasting, and the imposition of hands, ordain him unto the work of the ministry, among the above said people, the third Thursday of October next.' He was ordered, therefore, over the people in Baltimore county, *and not over the Patuxent people!* [It is painful to have to expose such ignorance and absurdities, as we shall have to do in reply to this.] What makes this matter still more certain [says the reviewer] is, that the Patuxent people had, at this very time, a pastor settled over them. In September, 1715, a month before the ordination of Mr. Conn, it was ordered by the Presbytery, that Messrs. Anderson, McNish, and Gillespie, write a letter to the people of Patuxent, in relation to the present posture of their affairs. In this letter the Presbytery say: 'We have much comfort in hearing from our brother, your reverend pastor, that when (as is our practice) he was interrogated concerning the manner of his people's deportment towards him, in his pastoral office, he made his answers wholly to their advantage.' This letter is principally an exhortation to peace, and a caution against Satan's attempts to produce divisions among them." p. 344.

"Dr. Balch states that after the death of Mr. Taylor, [which, by the bye, he says was in 1703,] the congregation was vacant about three years, [namely, till 1706,] but at last obtained a pastor, the Rev. Mr. Magill, from some Presbytery in Scotland. We have already seen, [but not from Dr. Balch's letters,] that the name of Taylor ceases to appear on the minutes after the year 1709; [and why did not Magill's name, who had been Taylor's successor for three years, according to Dr. Balch, appear there also, at this early period?] that in 1711, the congregation called McNish, but that he declined; and in 1713, Magill was received as an ordained minister, as will be seen from the following extract: [that is, seven years after he had been Taylor's successor at Upper Marlborough, according to Dr. Balch.] Mr. Robert Lawson, Mr. Daniel Magill, [not Robert Magill, according to Dr. Balch,] and Mr. George Gillespie, having applied to Presbytery for admittance as members thereof, the Presbytery, finding, by their ample testimonials, that they have been legally and orderly ordained as ministers of the gospel, and that they have since behaved themselves as such, did cheerfully and cordially receive them, and they took their places.' The coincidence [he should have said discordance] does not stop here; Dr. Balch says Magill was an austere and morose man, got into difficulties with his people, and left them. [Dr. Balch says he and his congregation *soon parted*.] Accordingly we find that in 1715, two years after his settlement, [this is according to the reviewer, but if Dr. Balch's statement be credited, it would have been nine years,] there was trouble in the congregation, and that the Presbytery found it necessary to write to them, and to exhort them to exercise proper feelings towards their pastor; [this is the same letter that was written in 1715, just one month before the ordination of Mr. Conn, in which it was said there was so much cordiality and good feeling between that people and their pastor!! What a change is here!]

and in 1719, Mr. Magill was without any pastoral charge. Dr. Balch says, that after the departure of Mr. Magill, [*which took place soon after he settled among them, in 1706, says Dr. Balch,*] the congregation obtained, through the intervention of certain London merchants, the Rev. John Orme as their pastor. [Who would have thought that a strict Scotch congregation would have sought a minister from such a quarter ?] This also fully accords with the minutes ; for in 1720, Mr. John Orme presented to Synod his testimonials, and was received as a member. Min. of Pres. p. 51."

"Here, then, [says the reviewer,] are a series of coincidences [can he be in earnest !!] which can admit of no other explanation *than the truth of Dr. Balch's history.* According to him, Mr. Taylor came to this country with his people, towards the beginning of the last century. [Prof. Hodge says in 1690.] He died early, [Dr. B. says in 1703,] and after an interval of a few years, [Dr. B. says three,] was succeeded by Mr. Magill, who differed with his people and left them, [Dr. B. says soon after he settled among them,] and was succeeded by Mr. Orme in 1719. [Our reviewer had just told us, that Mr. Orme was received as a member of Presbytery in 1720.] We learn [says the reviewer] from the minutes that Mr. Taylor was a member of the Presbytery in 1705 ; that he was dead in 1710 ; [what has become of the coincidences which were to prove the truth of Dr. Balch's history ?] that as soon as he died, the Patuxent congregation were without a minister ; that as soon as Mr. Magill appears on the minutes, in 1713, they are found to have a pastor, [the minutes say no such thing, as we shall see presently,] and when he is reported without a charge, Mr. Orme appears, and not before. As these accounts are entirely independent of each other, [he might with great truth, have said contradictory, too,] *their agreement renders their correctness, even on the principles of the mathematical doctrine of chances, certain."*

This Princeton reviewer shall never teach the son of him who writes this, the Mathematics, if he can prevent it. This can hardly be said *to be spinning out history from his own imaginations, and setting down his vague impressions for positive facts* ; as he charged against Dr. Hill ; but it is attempting to spin out *historical verities* from absolute contradictions and the grossest absurdities.

Having given such copious extracts from the Princeton review, we shall now give some explanations, and a little information, which neither Prof. Hodge, nor his learned friend, with all their voluminous documents, had ever acquired, which will show what led these champions at controversy astray, and involved them in contradictions and absurdities. For if Dr. Hill had been straitened for the want of documents, these writers appear to be in a greater difficulty to know what use to make of their superabounding supply. They evidently became bewildered in their mass of clashing and discordant manuscripts.

1. They appear evidently not to understand the progress and state of the colony of Maryland, about the time of the formation of the mother Presbytery respected in this controversy. By referring to Dr.

Hawks's History of the Episcopal Church in Maryland, pp. 71, 72, he will see an act which was passed in the year 1692, "*establishing the Church of England in that province in all her rights, liberties and franchises, wholly and inviolable as they then were, or should thereafter be established by law.*" Among other provisions of this act, the whole province, as far as the population extended, was divided into ten counties, which were again subdivided into thirty-one parishes. Five of these counties and fourteen of the parishes, lay on the eastern shore. The remaining five counties, and seventeen of the parishes, lay on the west of the Chesapeake bay. Ann Arundel, Calvert, and St. Mary's counties, lay bordering upon the bay from the mouth of Patapsco to the Potomac river. Charles county bordered upon the Potomac river, including three parishes, the most western of which was Nanjemoy and Piscataway, which shows how high the population extended up that river. Baltimore was a frontier county lately organized, including all the rest of the province, as far as the population extended, and which was not included in the limits, set to the other counties. This county included four parishes, namely, St. Paul's, St. Andrew's, St. George's, and St. John's. Some of these parishes, Dr. Hawks tells us, were of very great extent, and very thinly populated; were without any settled minister at the time alluded to, and for a considerable time afterward; and bordered upon the Indian territory and settlements, and were often exposed to bloodshed and depredations. Baltimore being a barrier, and frontier county, had no other limits, but the bounds of older counties, which all lay east of it, so that it ran indefinitely west. This was a common practice in the early settlements of Virginia and other provinces. As the population filled up new counties were laid off. The frontier county was unrestricted in its limits, and other frontier counties were laid off as population extended. Prince George's county, which now includes all the settlements, with the very rich land, upon the head waters of the Patuxent, was not then formed, so that all these settlements, including Upper Marlborough, Bladensburg, and the circumjacent regions, lay in the bounds of, and belonged to Baltimore county. There was no such town, or city, as Baltimore, then laid off, around which the county of Baltimore now lies in very contracted limits. If this state of things had been known or recollected, it would not have been thought, because Mr. Conn received a call from Baltimore county, and settled there, that a conclusive argument had been found, to prove that Dr. Hill had committed an egregious blunder in saying that Mr. Conn was called and ordained as minister at Upper Marlborough, which then lay in Baltimore county. Dr. Hill's opponents certainly set up the shout of triumph before they were quite ready for it.

2. Another thing which led these accurate opponents of Dr. Hill astray, was the idea they entertained, that there was but one congregation or settlement, upon the waters of Patuxent, that belonged to, or received attention from the mother Presbytery; and *that Marlbo-*

rough and the Patuxent people, always in the minutes of Presbytery meant the same thing; whereas there were scattering settlements extending for many miles up and down that river, to whom frequent supplies were sent by the Presbytery. In fact it was complete missionary ground in those days, which in a short time afforded materials for several small congregations. These desolate regions were settled chiefly by dissenters, which the intolerant Episcopalians, then the ESTABLISHED religion, were willing enough to wink at, as it threw a barrier or border settlement between them and their formidable enemies, the Indians. The intolerant Episcopalians of Virginia did the same, in permitting the French Huguenots to settle at Manekin town upon James river, and the German emigrants to locate themselves upon the waters of the Rappahanoc. This decided the character of the population which settled upon the Patuxent river, and which produced the connection between them and the mother Presbytery. And if we may be permitted, in our turn, to make a little use of the apocryphal letters of Dr. Balch, he himself tells us that Col. Ninian Beall procured the extensive tracts of land which he engrossed about Marlborough, the city of Washington and Georgetown, and others, by purchases from the Piscataway tribe of Indians, and which tradition says, cost him many a hard fought battle, before he obtained the peaceable possession.

3. Tradition confirms so far another of Dr. Balch's statements, that the people in these settlements availed themselves of a company of gentlemen about London, whom they requested to send ministers to preach the gospel to them. This was no doubt the same association which sent out Makemie, and afterwards Hampton and McNish; and about the year 1713 or 1714, Conn and Orme were commissioned from the same quarter. These London missionaries, without encountering the expense and delay of forming at first a connection with the Presbytery, came directly to the field pointed out to them, and commenced their active labors among the scattering settlements. Conn was so well known, and so popular among this people, that in 1714 he received a pressing invitation to become their pastor, but as he was as yet only a licentiate, and had never been fully ordained as a minister, it was thought advisable for him to become connected with the Presbytery, and receive the invitation and ordination at their hands; he was accordingly ordained in October, 1715, and became their pastor. Orme some time after followed his example. In 1719 he united with the Presbytery, and lived and died as a pastor to the people on Patuxent, and near neighbor to Mr. Conn till death separated them. Col. Beall and James Gordon, two Scotch merchants, who carried on a profitable frontier trade, took an active part in obtaining the ministerial services of Mr. Conn. Conn and Orme were indefatigable laborers, and organized several small congregations in this missionary field. There is ground to believe, that after some years Conn retired from Marlborough, and confined his labors to Bladensburg and another charge which he served, higher up the Patux-

ent river, and more convenient to Bladensburg; while Orme served Marlborough and another small congregation somewhere in the neighborhood. Dr. Hill was, therefore, so far incorrect, if he supposed Conn died the pastor of Marlborough; which, however, he did not positively assert.

If the Princeton reviewer would now find out who was the minister that had been laboring among the people of Patuxent, and was still looked upon as their pastor, he must look to Conn, between whom and that people there was so strong an attachment, and who was, according to their invitation, their pastor elect, and was soon to become so in reality. It would be absurd to suppose it was Magill who was thus spoken of by the Presbytery, for if he had ever labored among that people, of which we have no evidence but Dr. Balch's letters, it was but for a very short time, and they soon parted without much cordiality between them. This makes sense and consistency in the minutes of Presbytery, and their letter of advice to that people, which was addressed "to our dear Christian friends of Marlborough."

4. But what shall be said respecting the call McNish received from this congregation soon after the death of Taylor, in the year 1711? This is entirely the fabrication of this zealous partisan reviewer, since the minutes of Presbytery warrant no such assumption and contain no such fancy. The true state of the case was this. About this time Mr. McNish resigned his charge on the eastern shore of Maryland, and was without any pastoral charge. The destitute settlements upon the Patuxent river, who were chiefly dissenters, hearing of this, solicited him to come and labor among them, and supply them in their destitution. About the same time he received an invitation from Jamaica, on Long Island, to become their pastor. McNish lays this business before the Presbytery, and asks their advice in the case. The Presbytery chose not to decide, but referred the matter to his own discretion, only urging it upon him to decide quickly, as the necessities of the people were great, and needed assistance. He makes his decision to accept the invitation from Jamaica, and the Presbytery proceed immediately to send supplies to the destitute people on the Patuxent river who had been disappointed in their expectation from Mr. McNish. Now, out of these plain and simple facts, the ingenuity of the reviewer has tortured the minutes to make them speak of a call from an organized congregation on the Patuxent, or at Upper Marlborough, which, by his tampering with the records, he makes to be the same. All this is done to prove that Dr. Hill had stated what was false, when he said there had been no organized church on the Patuxent before the ordination and settlement of Mr. Conn among them. In all the minutes relied upon there is never mention made of a congregation or church on the Patuxent, but they are spoken of as *the people of Patuxent*; nor of a *call* for any minister, before Mr. James Gordon, from Upper Marlborough on the Patuxent, and in Baltimore county, was the bearer of one for Conn. Church history should be written with more candor and less party zeal than Prof.

Hodge, or his own zealous friend, have exemplified during this whole business, to speak of no other and greater transactions of the sort.

There is one other subject connected with this that deserves a little notice. The congregation or church of Marlborough and Patuxent, according to their version, mean one and the same thing. And in order to leave the door open for Mr. Orme, who comes some years after Mr. Conn, they locate Conn in a congregation somewhere in Baltimore county, no doubt it was thought in the neighborhood of the town of Baltimore, about 40 miles from Bladensburg, with which it was to be a collegiate church. Where this Baltimore church was located no one can tell further than *that it was not on the Patuxent*, according to them. This, however, is the first and last of this Baltimore county congregation that was ever heard of. Into such absurdities will party zeal sometimes carry good and learned men.

But we have a few more remarks to make respecting Dr. Balch's letters, upon which so much dependence is placed, and which go so directly to disprove Dr. Hill's statements. The reviewer has given us a little more information respecting these letters than Prof. H. had done, to prove that they were not written in his second childhood, as Dr. Hill had conjectured. But after all we have but such garbled extracts as they were willing should meet the public eye. This advantage they had from their unpublished documents;—and if these selected extracts afford such evidence of absurdity, and want of correct information, what might not have been expected had we been permitted to see the whole of these precious manuscripts *in extenso*!

See the Princeton review, pp. 346, 347. The writer here furnishes the following information respecting these letters:—

“Dr. Balch furnishes two accounts of this interesting congregation, [i. e. the Scotch congregation of Upper Marlborough, composed of two hundred emigrants from Scotland, with the Rev. Mr. Taylor, their pastor, whom they brought over with them,] one is dated April 2, 1793, and the other December 18, 1810, neither, therefore, written during his second childhood, as Dr. Hill conjectures. The former, which is more general than the other, does not present a single case of discrepancy with the official records of the Presbytery.”

In a note the reviewer gives this further account of this first letter:—

“We here insert all that part of his account of the early history of this congregation: ‘In the reign of Charles II, king of Great Britain, a persecution was set on foot by the Episcopalians, against the Presbyterians. This storm fell with great weight upon ——(we cannot,” says he, “make out this word,) many of them were burnt, drowned, hung, or otherwise tortured to death; others were com-

pelled to leave their pleasant houses, their wives and children, and to take refuge in foreign climes. Of this latter class was Col. Ninian Beall, a native of North Britain, who, for the sake of conscience, fled from his own land and nation, and fought for that liberty in Maryland, which was denied him on the other side of the Atlantic. Some years after his arrival in Maryland, he made purchase of several tracts of land, from the tribe of the Piscataway Indians. On one of these tracts he laid out the town of Upper Marlborough, and there fixed his own residence. Remembering that he had a large number of relations at home, subject to the same sufferings from which he had escaped; and now enjoying the sweets of civil and religious liberty, he wrote to his friends to come over to Maryland, and participate in his happiness, urging it upon them, at the same time, to bring with them a faithful minister of the gospel. *They arrived some months afterwards, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Taylor, their pastor.* Col. Beall marked off a lot, in Upper Marlborough, for a meeting house and burying ground, containing one and a half acres of land. A house for public worship was built, and the small but growing congregation was happy and thankful under the labors of their minister; when, lo! Mr. Taylor, to the great grief and consternation of his flock, was suddenly called into the invisible world. They lamented for a time this dark process of divine Providence. At last, however, they took courage and made application to some of the Presbyteries or Synods of Scotland for another minister. Mr. Magill was sent over, and being of a morose and sulky temper, he and the congregation soon differed and parted. The Rev. John Orme, a native of Derbyshire, was fixed on for their next pastor. He arrived at Upper Marlborough in 1719, and continued laboring among them with success, until the year 1758, when he was removed from his charge by death.

“In his second communication, [says the reviewer,] Dr. Balch goes more into detail. After narrating the particular manner of Col. Beall’s escape from Scotland, he fixes his arrival in this country at about 1690, and that of his friends, to the number of at least two hundred, about 1700.”

The reviewer differs here from the account given by Prof. Hodge about ten years, and yet both profess to derive their statements from Dr. B.’s letters. However, the reviewer in a note undertakes to prove how this discrepancy occurred. Says he:—

“Prof. Hodge was inaccurate in stating 1690, instead of 1700, as the date of Mr. Taylor’s arrival in this country. This mistake arose from his confusing the two accounts given by Dr. Balch. In the one, he states that Col. Beall arrived in 1690, and in the other, that his friends came *some time after*, without mentioning the year.”

This is a disingenuous misquotation. Dr. Balch’s words are, as the reader may see by looking a little back,—“*They arrived some months afterward, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Taylor, their pastor.*”

In this lame manner does the reviewer attempt to relieve our professor from a difficulty which placed him in an unenviable attitude. The reviewer apologizes further. "Hence," says he, "Mr. Hodge stated the time as about 1690." How did the reviewer know what led Prof. H. into this mistake? Did the professor tell him how he came to make that blunder, or did the professor write the review himself? If it was the reviewer's own doing, without Professor Hodge's privity, he deserves a reproof for making so lame an apology. But further, says he:—

"This mistake is of little consequence, as the only point of interest was to show that Mr. Taylor was in this country before the organization of the presbytery in 1705. Dr. Balch calls Mr. Taylor, Mr. James Taylor, instead of Nathaniel, and Mr. Magill he calls Robert Magill, instead of Daniel Magill. He also places the death of Mr. Taylor in 1703, whereas he was living in September, 1709."

These are slight mistakes, which, instead of affecting the correctness of Dr. Balch's statements, only go to confirm them; as these are the words of the writer of this critique, will not the reader call it an ill-natured caricature of the reviewer? But we will let him speak for himself:—

"Such inaccuracies are precisely what might have been expected from an attempt to be so particular in giving from tradition such minute circumstances.

"*Instead, however, of weakening the credibility of his account, they rather confirm it, by showing that it is entirely independent of official records, [aye, and contradictory of them, too,] by which, as to all essential points, it is so wonderfully confirmed; namely, That Taylor was pastor of Marlborough before 1705, [but had been dead two years,] that he died early, [i. e. before the presbytery was formed,] that he was succeeded by Magill, and he by Orme, are sustained by the coincident state of the minutes, in such a manner as to leave no doubt of their correctness.*"

But the minutes say not a word about Taylor's being Pastor of Marlborough, nor Magill's succeeding him, nor Orme's succeeding Magill, the only points essential in the present controversy, and which, instead of being proved, are now sophistically assumed and confidently asserted.

The fact is, that these essential points, to say nothing of contradictions, are to be gathered exclusively and alone, from these apocryphal letters of Dr. Balch, and are sustained by nothing, but the effrontery of those who say to the contrary. It is strange that any one who has any regard for reputation, or respect for his reader's judgment, would hazard such assertions. This again, *instead of spinning out history from his own imagination, and setting down his vague*

conjectures as positive facts, is attempting to establish his positions by direct contradictions, and the grossest absurdities.

To give but one more instance of the loose, incoherent and contradictory manner in which Dr. Balch wrote respecting historical facts, let the following be noticed. He states that Col. Ninian Beall fled from Scotland during the persecution of the Presbyterians under the reign of Charles II. and arrived and settled in Maryland, in 1690. Now let it be remembered, that Charles II died in the year 1685, i. e. five years before Col. Beall left Scotland. Charles II was succeeded the same year he died, by James II, under whose reign persecution had in a great measure died away in Scotland. In 1688, two years before his leaving Scotland, James abdicated the throne and fled from his country, and the glorious REVOLUTION of 1688 was effected by William, Prince of Orange, when Episcopacy was abolished, and Presbyterianism re-established in Scotland, and the act of Toleration passed, securing liberty of conscience to all dissenters within the British empire.

Again, Dr. Balch states, that within a short time after Col. Beall arrived in Maryland, where he enjoyed all the sweets of religious freedom and civil liberty, he wrote over and prevailed upon his persecuted relations in Scotland, to come over and enjoy with him the sweets and privileges of his new home, who within a few months after arrived to the amount of 200, &c. But in the year 1692, Maryland had disgraced herself so far, as to abolish her former noble and liberal charter, and to establish the Episcopal church of England, in all its privileges, immunities, rights, franchises, &c. &c. and was pretty rigorously executing the persecuting enactments of that church, as we learn from the treatment which Makemie, Hampton, and McNish received, on the eastern shore of Maryland. Here we see Dr. Balch makes Col. Beall, Mr. Taylor, and 200 Scotchmen, fly from persecution in Scotland, many years after persecution had there ceased, and Presbyterianism was there established and riding in all its glory at the right hand of the regal civil power; and Maryland was imitating her neighbor, Virginia, in persecuting and harrassing dissenters whenever they fairly stood in her way.

And yet Professor H. and his keen sighted advocate, let all these gross blunders and anachronisms pass as sober realities, and unquestionable historical verities. Had they been as willing to have detected inaccuracies, and contradictions, and absurdities in Dr. Balch, as they were in Dr. Hill, matters would have appeared to them very differently from what they did. But there is a great difference between *your bull* and *my ox*, and this alters the case!

Query. Why did not the Scotch historians, Cruikshank and Wodrow, with all their circumstantiality and particularity of detail, make mention of the sufferings of Col. Ninian Beale, the Rev. James Taylor, and their expatriation, with at least 200 Scotch refugees from persecution? Echo answers, WHY?

There are some other things of minor importance contained in this Princeton review, which might have been noticed and refuted, but time and circumstances will not admit of it; nor is it necessary, as their frivolity will render them quite harmless.

One more extract, and only one, shall close our present notice of this writer. Page 348.

“After the exhibition which has just been made,” says he, “we are satisfied, the public will feel, that they have no right to assume *that the correctness of Dr. Hill’s representations is admitted, should they be allowed to pass uncontradicted.*”

Persons who conceive they are seated in high places, are apt to treat a common enemy contemptuously, and it has often proved very dangerous policy. But it strikes us, that this is certainly *in bad taste*; so decidedly and exultingly claiming a victory, and declaring an enemy demolished, to make a proclamation that they mean hereafter never to notice what he might say or do. This preinature triumph may have different constructions. It may be thought to proceed from sheer vanity, or an overweening opinion of our own smartness; forgetting at the same time the taunting reply, “*your trumpeter is dead.*” Or it might have proceeded from timidity or cowardice, which dreaded to meet an adversary the second time. At any rate, *this wisdom descendeth not from above.*

But if these, and such like objections and aspersions, are all that Dr. Hill may expect from the head quarters of hostility, he may well congratulate himself; for no doubt he must, and did expect, that more serious errors, and weighty objections might have been found in his hasty production; for he certainly has passed through such hands, so able and so willing to make a finish of him — if they could — with fewer wounds and broken bones, than might have been expected. But truth, and not victory, or reputation, or the spoils of office, appears to have been his object.

SIMPLEX.

